



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,158	07/12/2004	Philippe Thurot	AP017-04	5346

29689 7590 11/13/2007
DAVID A. GUERRA
INTERNATIONAL PATENT GROUP, LLC
2025 17TH AVENUE N.W.
CALGARY, AB T2M 0S7
CANADA

EXAMINER

BOWERS, NATHAN ANDREW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1797

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/501,158	Applicant(s) THUROT, PHILIPPE	
	Examiner Nathan A. Bowers	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>071204</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 4-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Claims 4-8 depend on claim 3, which is also a multiple dependent claim. Accordingly, claims 4-8 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "should be" in line 15 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). More specifically, it is unclear whether the claim narrowly requires the use of only zirconium oxide sensors, or more generally any sensor characterized by a short response time.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 4670148) in view of Katz (US 4838733).

With respect to claim 1, Schneider discloses an optimized system for the regulation and discontinuous measurement of the gas content in composting waste. At least one remote bay (Figure 1:19) contains one or more gas measurement probes (Figure 2:10.1-10.5) that are capable of determining oxygen and carbon dioxide concentration. This is disclosed in column 2, lines 30-58 and in column 3, lines 12-40. Column 5, lines 40-57 state that the operation of a gas intake pump (Figure 1:13) and a plurality of electric valves (Figure 2:11.1-11.5) is regulated by a program controller (Figure 1:17). A pipe (Figure 1:9.3) connects each of the electric valves to a gas sampling device such that gases at the sampling device are sent to the measurement probes. The oxygen measurement probe is able to supply within a very short response time the measurement of oxygen content in the compost material. As evidenced by the Figures, the sampling device comprises a rod with two opposite ends able to be driven

into a pile of compost. Schneider, however, does not expressly disclose that the sampling rods include an air intake strainer.

Katz discloses a system in which air samples are removed from a compost pile using a plurality of sampling device rods (Figure 3:32). The rods are connected to a pump (Figure 1:78) capable of drawing gases through the use of suction. Column 3, lines 9-40 state that each rod includes an air intake strainer (Figure 3:48 and Figure 7:184).

Schneider and Katz are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor regarding compost gas removal devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to include screens on each of the sampling rods disclosed by Schneider. Katz teaches that it is important to preclude the movement of solid compost chunks into the sampling rods. The use of screens effectively prevents such fouling while still allowing the sampling of gases. Katz teaches that the screens enable the passage of a great volume of gases over a given time, but holds back the solid materials of the landfill.

With respect to claim 2, Schneider and Katz disclose the apparatus set forth in claim 1 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection above. In addition, Schneider clearly teaches that the electric valves are physically separated from the program controller. The operation of the valves is regulated using the program controller, however.

With respect to claim 3, Schneider and Katz disclose the apparatus set forth in claims 1 and 2 as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections above. Additionally, Katz clearly teaches that the sampling rods are connected to the pipe using a coupling (Figure 4:160) facilitating the fastening and insertion of the pipe. This is described in column 5, lines 47-64. The use of this type of coupling arrangement would have easily been incorporated into the design of Schneider, and would only require minor structural changes. The use of couplings to connect pipes is considered to be well known in the art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Johnson (US 4026355) reference teaches the state of the art regarding systems capable of withdrawing landfill gases.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan A. Bowers whose telephone number is (571) 272-8613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/501,158
Art Unit: 1797

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



NAB



GLADYS JP CORCORAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER